



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/687,109

10/15/2003

P. Mark Hogarth

4102-4-1

8719

22442 7590 11/02/2005

SHERIDAN ROSS PC
1560 BROADWAY
SUITE 1200
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER

BORIN, MICHAEL L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1631

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/687,109	Applicant(s) HOGARTH ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael Borin	Art Unit 1631	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 58-74 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 65-74 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 58-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

Claims 58-74 are pending.

Response to restriction requirement filed 08/03/2005 is acknowledged. Applicant elected, with traverse, Group I.2. Upon review of the restriction requirement, however, the requirement to restrict between groups I.1-I.4 was deemed unnecessary because the claims are directed to a composition, not to a method of making, and method of making the composition does not have patentable weight in determining patentability of the composition. . Therefore, the restriction within groups I-IV is withdrawn, and the applicant's election of Group I.2, is taken as election of group I, claims 58-64. With respect to applicant's traverse of restriction between Groups I and II, Examiner maintains that the products are viewed as being patentably distinct because of different structural and functional properties.

The restriction requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL. Claims 65-74 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected groups. Cancellation of claims 65-74 is requested.

With respect to election of species, applicant elected organic compounds.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 103.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C.102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

Art Unit: 1631

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 58-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as obvious over Shreiber et al (US 2002/0068703; priority date 09/30/1993).

The reference teaches method of preventing phagocytosis of immune complexes comprising use of inhibitor of Fcγ receptor (claim 1). The inhibitor can be a peptide or peptide mimetic (claim 3), such as a fragment of Fc.γ.RIIA or Fc.γ.RIIIA or of Fc.ε.RI (claims 7-9). The inhibitor can be introduced in liposome formulation (claim 5). As such, the reference described the use of a therapeutic composition comprising an inhibitor of FcγR and thus reads on the therapeutic composition of the instant claims comprising an inhibitor of FcγR.

With respect to method of making/identifying the inhibitor, the claim is in product-by-process format, and as such, it is the novelty and patentability of the instantly claimed product that need to be established and not that of the recited process steps.

Art Unit: 1631

In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972); In re Wertheim, USPQ (CCPA 1976). The use of a 102/103 rejection for the rejection of a product-by-process claim has been approved by the courts. While the reference does not specifically disclose the inhibitory compound produced/identified by the crystallography method of the instant claims, production of a product by a particular process does not impart novelty or unobviousness to a protein when the same protein is taught by the prior art. This is particularly true when the properties of the product are not changed by the process in an unexpected manner. See *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC 1985); *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289, 292-293 (CAFC 1983); *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent, and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 58-64 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6355683 or claims 1-20 of US Patent 6835753. An obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the referenced claim(s) because the examined claim is either anticipated, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the referenced patents teach compositions comprising Fcy receptor inhibitor and method of use thereof. With respect to method of making/identifying the inhibitor, the claim is in product-by-process format, and as such, it is the novelty and patentability of the instantly claimed product that need to be established and not that of the recited process steps.

Conclusion.

No claims are allowed
Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Borin whose telephone number is (571) 272-0713. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, Ph.D., can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1631

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Michael Borin, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1631

mlb